1 2 3 4	DEBORAH B. CAPLAN [SBN 196606] LANCE H. OLSON [SBN 077634] ERIN V. PETH [SBN 227850] OLSON HAGEL & FISHBURN LLP 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1425 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 442-2952					
5	Facsimile: (916) 442-1280 Attorneys for Plaintiffs California Democratic Party					
7 8 9 10	CHARLES H. BELL, JR. [SBN 060553] JIMMIE E. JOHNSON [SBN 223344] BELL, McANDREWS & HILTACHK, LLP 455 Capitol Mall, Suite 801 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 442-7757					
11 12	Orange County Republican Party					
131415	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
16						
17 18	CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN PARTY; CALIFORNIA DEMOCRATIC PARTY; ORANGE COUNTY REPUBLICAN PARTY;	CASE NO.: CIV.S-04-2144 FCD PAN STIPULATION FOR JUDGMENT OF				
19	Plaintiffs, vs.	DISMISSAL				
20	FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION;					
21	LIANE RANDOLPH, in her official capacity; SHERIDAN DOWNEY II, in his official capacity; THOMAS KNOX, in his official capacity,					
22	PHILLIP BLAIR, in his official capacity; PAMELA KARLAN, in her official capacity,					
2324	Defendants.					
25						
26	Plaintiffs California Republican Party, Calif	ornia Democratic Party, and Orange County				
27	Republican Party (collectively, "plaintiffs") and defendants California Fair Political Practices					
28	Commission, Liane Randolph, Sheridan Downey III, Thomas Knox, Philip Blair, and Pamela					

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

Karlan (collectively,	"defendants") hereby	enter into this	Stipulation for	Judgment of	of Dismissal
as follows:					

Whereas, on October 27, 2004, the Hon. Frank C. Damrell, Jr. entered a preliminary injunction in this matter finding that there were serious questions as to the constitutionality of Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 in light of the Ninth Circuit's decision in American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada v. Heller, 378 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2004), addressing onpublication disclosure requirements imposed upon political advertising;

Whereas, on March 21, 2005, the California Fair Political Practices Commission adopted as Commission policy that Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 are unlawful as applied against general purpose committees, based on the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada v. *Heller* decision, as stated in the attached Resolution;

Whereas, on March 21, 2005, the California Fair Political Practices Commission further resolved not to enforce Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 against general purpose committees as stated in the attached Resolution;

Whereas, on September 1, 2005, the California Fair Political Practices Commission adopted amendments to California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 18450.4, which reflect the foregoing determination that, based upon the *Heller* case, Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 would be unconstitutional if applied to general purpose committees, and which makes those sections inapplicable to such committees; and

Whereas plaintiffs are satisfied that the Commission's actions are the functional equivalent of declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to the constitutionality of Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 as applied to general purpose committees.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the respective attorneys of record for plaintiffs and defendants that, subject to the Court's approval, judgment shall immediately be entered in this action as follows:

1. Plaintiffs contend and defendants concede that, based upon the Heller case, Government Code sections 84503 and 84506 cannot constitutionally be applied to general purpose committees. Defendants have adopted a regulation that makes it clear that those sections do not apply to such

OLSON HAGEL & FISHBURN LLP 555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 1425, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

Case 2:04-cv-02144-FCD-PAN Document 48 Filed 01/03/06 Page 3 of 3

1	committees, and cannot be asserted in any action regarding such committees brought by the Fair				
2	Political Practices Commission or by a private party.				
3	2. This action is dismissed without prejudice as moot.				
4	3. Plaintiffs are the prevailing parties and are entitled to reasonable attorney fees and costs				
5	in the amount of \$ 60,000.00.				
6					
7	Dated: December2005	OLSON, HAGEL, & FISHBURN, LLP			
8					
9		By: DEBORAH B. CAPLAN			
10		Attorneys for Plaintiff			
		California Democratic Party			
11	Dated: December2005	BELL, McANDREWS & HILTACHK, LLP			
12					
13		By:CHARLES H. BELL, JR.			
14		Attorneys for Plaintiffs			
15		California Republican Party and			
16		Orange County Republican Party			
	Dated: December 2005	BILL LOCKYER			
17		Attorney General of the State of California			
18		By:			
19		DOUGLAS J. WOODS			
20		Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants Fair Political Practices			
21		Commission, Liane Randolph, Sheridan Downey III Thomas Knox, Philip Blair, Pamela Karlan			
22		Thomas Khox, Thuip Blait, Tameia Karian			
23	<u>ORDER</u>				
24	The Clerk of Court is directed to enter final judgment according to the terms of the above				
25	Stipulation.				
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
27	Detade December 20, 2005	/a/ Frank C. Damrall In			
28	Dated: December 30, 2005	/s/ Frank C. Damrell Jr. HON. FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR.			
		3			